

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are currently pending, wherein claims 1 and 20 have been amended to even more clearly define the present invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration in view of the remarks presented herein below.

In paragraph 2 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-11 and 16-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the prior art discussed on pages 1-2 of the specification, i.e., Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 11-69319 to Tokkaihei<sup>1</sup> ("Tokkaihei") in view of Program and System Information Protocol for Terrestrial Broadcast and Cable, Doc. A/65 (the "A/65" document). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met. First, there must be some motivation to modify/combine the cited references. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the combination must teach each and every claimed element. In the present case, claims 1-11 and 16-23 are not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Tokkaihei and the A/65 document for at least the reason that the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element as discussed below.

Independent claim 1 defines a device for providing an electronic program guide. The device includes, *inter alia*, an editing means for editing electronic program information received from a broadcasting source; an electronic program information

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants note that U.S. Patent No. 7,111,315 corresponds to Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 11-69319.

storage means for storing the electronic program information edited by said editing means; and a table generation means for generating a plurality of electronic program guide information tables using the electronic program information stored in said electronic program information storage means, and transmitting the plurality of electronic program guide information tables as transport stream packets. In addition, said editing means generates update information on the updating of the electronic program information and said table generation means determines which of said plurality of electronic program guide information tables needs to be generated based on said update information.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Tokkaihei, as discussed on pages 1-2 of the specification, discloses a device as claimed with the exception of the table generating means determining which of said plurality of tables needs to be generated based on the update information provided by the editing means. Accordingly, the Examiner relies on the A/65 document to overcome the deficiencies of Tokkaihei. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to "modify Self-admitted prior art with the teaching of DOC. A/65 so to reduce bandwidth usage between the central delivery center of master EPG and each of the remote broadcasting distribution stations by identifying only tables that need to be updated." To support these assertions, the Examiner points to pages 72-74 of the A/65 document. These assertions are unfounded for the following reasons.

First, the A/65 does not disclose a device that includes a table generator that determines which of said plurality of electronic program guide information tables needs

to be generated based on said update information, and transmits the plurality of electronic program guide information tables as transport stream packets as claimed. To the contrary, the A/65 document defines a Standard for System Information (SI) and Program Guide (PG) data compatible with digital multiplex bit streams constructed in accordance with ISO/IEC 13818-1 (MPEG 2 Systems). More specifically, the A/65 document defines the standard protocol for transmission of the relevant data tables contained within packets carried in the Transport Stream multiplex. Although, this protocol requires transmitting a Master Guide Table (MGT) providing general information about all the other tables that comprise the PSIP standard, it does not disclose or suggest how/when updated information tables should be generated by the *provider*.

The MGT is generally generated in order to recognize update information in the receiving side of a broadcast. The A/65 document does not disclose or suggest *how* the MGT is generated at the transmitting side, it merely requires the inclusion of a version number in the master guide table, in order to indicate which tables in the transport stream have been updated. Based on the version number, among other things, included in the MGT, a *receiver/decoder* to determine whether or not to reload the newly defined tables for proper operation. See page 76, last paragraph of the A/65 document. This is not equivalent to determining when to generate the tables at the transmitting side.

Accordingly, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Tokkaihei and the A/65 document, the combination would only result in a device that updates

versions numbers in response to updated information tables. There is nothing in the A/65 document to prevent the APA device from continuing to regenerate *all* the tables in response to updated information and only updating the versions numbers in the master guide table for those tables containing new information. This is not equivalent to the claimed invention. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Tokkaihei and the A/65 document because the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element.

Independent claim 20 defines a method of generating electronic program guide information tables. The method includes, *inter alia*, receiving edited electronic guide information; storing the received edited electronic program guide information; generating a plurality of electronic guide information tables; receiving electronic program guide update information; determining whether one or more of said plurality of electronic program guide tables needs to be updated based on the electronic program guide update information; and re-generating only those electronic program guide information tables determined to need updating; and transmitting the plurality of electronic program guide information tables as transport stream packets. Accordingly, independent claim 20 is patentable over the combination of Tokkaihei and the A/65 document for at least those reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1.

Claims 2-11, 16-19, and 21-23 variously depend from independent claims 1 and 20. Therefore, claims 2-11, 16-19, and 21-23 are patentable over the combination of Tokkaihei and the A/65 document for at least those reasons discussed above with

regard to claims 1 and 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-11 and 16-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In paragraph 3 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 12-15 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of Tokkaihei and the A/65 document, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,666,645 to Thomas et al. ("Thomas"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 12-15 and 24-26 variously depend from independent claims 1 and 20. Therefore, claims 12-15 and 24-26 are patentable over the combination of Tokkaihei and the A/65 document for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 20.

Thomas discloses a data management and distribution system for an electronic program guide for television programs that includes an automated data collection subsystem. However, Thomas fails to overcome the deficiencies of Tokkaihei and the A/65 document.

Since Tokkaihei, the A/65 document and Thomas each fail to disclose or suggest a device for providing electronic program information that includes a table generation means as claimed, the combination of these three references cannot possibly disclose or suggest said element. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine Tokkaihei, the A/65 document and Thomas, the combination would still fail to render claims 12-15 and 24-26 unpatentable because the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request


reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-15 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Penny Caudle (Reg. No. 46,607) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  <sup>Reg #</sup> 46,607  
Michael K. Mutter  
Registration No.: 29,680  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant